arXiv:0802.0942v1 [gr-qc] 7 Feb 2008

General Relativity as Classical Limit of Evolutionary Quantum Gravity

Giovanni Montani[123], **Francesco Cianfrani**[1]
[1]ICRA—International Center for Relativistic Astrophysics
Dipartimento di Fisica (G9),
Università di Roma, "La Sapienza",
Piazzale Aldo Moro 5, 00185 Rome, Italy.
[2]ENEA C.R. Frascati (Dipartimento F.P.N.),
Via Enrico Fermi 45, 00044 Frascati, Rome, Italy.
[3]ICRANet C. C. Pescara, Piazzale della Repubblica, 10, 65100 Pescara, Italy.

E-mail: `montani@icra.it`
`francesco.cianfrani@icra.it`

Abstract.

We analyze the dynamics of the gravitational field when the covariance is restricted to a synchronous gauge. In the spirit of the Noether theorem, we determine the conservation law associated to the Lagrangian invariance and we outline that a non-vanishing behavior of the Hamiltonian comes out. We then interpret such resulting non-zero "energy" of the gravitational field in terms of a dust fluid. This new matter contribution is co-moving to the slicing and it accounts for the "materialization" of a synchronous reference from the corresponding gauge condition. Further, we analyze the quantum dynamics of a generic inhomogeneous Universe as described by this evolutionary scheme, asymptotically to the singularity. We show how the phenomenology of such a model overlaps the corresponding Wheeler-DeWitt picture. Finally, we study the possibility of a Schrödinger dynamics of the gravitational field as a consequence of the correspondence inferred between the ensemble dynamics of stochastic systems and the WKB limit of their quantum evolution. We demonstrate that the time dependence of the ensemble distribution is associated with the first order correction in $\hbar$ to the WKB expansion of the energy spectrum.

PACS numbers: 83.C

1. INTRODUCTION

The absence of a real time evolution of the physical states for the quantum gravitational field, is one of the most peculiar aspects characterizing the Wheeler-DeWitt equation [1]. It emerges as a direct consequence of implementing on a quantum level the 4-diffeomorphisms invariance of General Relativity. In fact, in the sliced picture of the space-time, the manifold $\mathcal{V}^4$ is represented by a one-parameter family of spacelike hypersurfaces (*i.e.* $\mathcal{V}^4 \rightarrow \sigma^3_t \otimes \mathcal{R}$) and the dynamics is summarized by the primary and secondary constraints, due to the presence of four Lagrangian multipliers (the lapse function and the shift vector) [2]. Hence, extending the canonical Dirac methods of quantization constraints to the gravitational sector, the *frozen formalism* arises [3]. For a detailed discussion of the problem of time in quantum gravity and for a review of different proposals to overcome it, see [4] (about the nature of time in quantum cosmology, see [5], while for an evolutionary scenario coming out in the semi-classical limit see [6]). A valid discussion of the relation existing among time, matter, and reference frames in canonical quantum gravity is given in [7, 8].

In [9] and [10] it was inferred that the non-evolutionary character of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation is a consequence of requiring that the 3+1-splitting of the space-time holds also on a quantum level. The point is that, in a covariant picture, the canonical quantization applies only if a physical reference fluid is included into the dynamics. In fact, the timelike character of the 4-velocity associated to a fluid has to be preserved in a quantum space-time too and it allows a physical slicing. The analysis presented in [9, 10] includes the so-called kinematical action into the evolution and shows how the resulting "frame fixing" quantization of the vacuum gravitational field induces the appearance of a matter fluid as a source. The approach based on the kinematical action can be re-casted as a Schrödinger dynamics for the quantum gravitational field [17]. This same point of view was also addressed in [11], where it is outlined how the quantum gravitational field, viewed in a synchronous (or Gaussian) frame, acquires an evolutionary character and a dust fluid arises into the dynamics (see also the related discussion in [12]). Other important approaches based on the so-called embedding variables, and even referred to the path integral formalism, can be found in [13]-[15] (see also [16]).

Here we face the classical and the quantum dynamics of the synchronous gravitational field, starting from a restriction of the covariance principle to those coordinates transformations which preserve the choice of this gauge. The phenomenological issue of the synchronous quantum gravity, so defined, outlines the appearance of a non-vanishing eigenvalue Hamiltonian, reflecting the presence of a dust fluid. Since the privileged role of a dust fluid as a physical clock is well-established in literature, we have to point out the peculiar aspects of our approach. In [11], [12] and [9] the construction of the clock is based on adding new terms to the system action, and then deriving the new Hamiltonian constraints. Here we focus attention on the symmetry of the synchronous space-time, having in mind that the choice of a

coordinate system must come out into additional energy-momentum contributions. We put in correlation the (restricted) symmetry invariance with the quantum nature of the appearing fluid. In fact, the violation of the general relativity principle singles out by the appearance of a source term, living in a covariant picture and whose energy (expected to be positive in the ground state) vanishes in the classical limit. The main new address of our investigations is essentially in this idea, that General Relativity is compatible with the synchronous quantum gravity. The discussion of Section 6 clarifies this point of view, by underlining the link between the restored quantum time variable and the spectrum dependence on $\hbar$.
This new contribution can be heuristically interpreted as the quantum "materialization" of the synchronous gauge imposed on the vacuum theory of gravity. We also address the request of having a positive energy density of the dust and we infer that the ground state of the theory ensures such requirement is fulfilled. The main point is that the magnitude of the eigenvalue arising from the generic quantum cosmology is bounded, of the order of $\hbar$, and vanishing in the classical limit $\hbar \to 0$. Hence, we discuss the possibility of a general character for this feature, and we provide an implementation of this point of view within the correspondence existing, for chaotic systems, between the ensemble distribution and the semiclassical wave function.

Thus, we conclude that a scenario can be inferred in which the time evolution of the quantum gravitational field takes place only at a higher order in the $\hbar$ expansion of the theory. In this respect, the phenomenology of this evolutionary quantum gravity overlaps the same issues of the Wheeler-DeWitt approach, and General Relativity is recovered in the classical limit. This result is a consequence of the "quantum" character of the device responsible for the emergence of time, thus providing an explanation for the applicability of the approach discussed in [20] into a cosmological setting. By other words, we fix a time-clock which turns out to be a quantum component of the whole system and so the notions of external and internal times converge.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we derive the fundamental constraints implied on the theory by the invariance of the Lagrangian, in the framework of a Noether theorem extended to the gravitational sector. Section 3 is devoted to discuss the canonical quantization of the synchronous gravitational field, and the question concerning the physical interpretation of the outcoming Hamiltonian eigenvalue. In Section 4, we formulate the cosmological problem inherent to a generic inhomogeneous Universe in the presence of a massless scalar field and of a cosmological term, which allow to model an inflationary scenario. We develop the canonical quantization of this model in the framework of a Schrödinger dynamics. The possibility to neglect the potential term, in the asymptotic limit to the cosmological singularity, allows to deal with an approximated analytic solution. The precise conditions for the validity of the proposed picture are as the ones for the existence of an inflationary scenario. The Hamiltonian eigenvalue comes out as ranging, in modulus, between zero and much less than the Planck energy. Since a negative portion of the spectrum arises, an estimate for the contribution of dust to the Universe critical parameter is given (assuming the Universe near its ground state). Such a contribution is extremely small $\mathcal{O}\left(10^{-60}\right)$ and therefore we are lead to phenomenologically recover no observability for a primordial quantum evolution of the Universe.

In Section 5, we discuss the quasi-classical limit of the model, which outlines how the variable associated to the Universe volume reaches the classical stage before the potential term becomes relevant in the dynamics.

In Section 6, we provide a discussion concerning the formulation of an evolutionary quantum gravity from a more general and gauge-independent context. The approach is based on comparing the ensemble representation of a stochastic system with the semiclassical WKB limit of its quantum dynamics. In particular, Section 6.1 is devoted to fix the paradigm of such a correspondence for a generic stochastic gravitational field. Here we show that a non-zero super-Hamiltonian eigenvalue is expected to reproduce the right behavior of the ensemble distribution. Section 6.2 discusses the implementation of the outlined scheme to the case of the inhomogeneous mixmaster model as a gravitational stochastic system.

Finally, in Section 7 we give some concluding remarks about the main lines of thinking fixed by the overall analysis.

2. GRAVITY IN A SYNCHRONOUS REFERENCE

In a synchronous (gaussian) reference frame to the splitting $y^\mu = y^\mu(t, x^i)$, the metric tensor corresponds to the choice $g_{00} = 1$ and $g_{0i} = 0$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$, *i.e.* in the 3+1-formalism we have to require $N = 1$ and $N^i = 0$ for the lapse function and for the shift vector, respectively. In order to fix the form of the coordinates transformations which preserve the synchronous character [18], we consider a generic infinitesimal displacement

$$t' = t + \xi(t,\ x^l) \quad x^{i'} = x^i + \xi^i(t,\ x^l) \tag{1}$$

and the associated 4-metric change

$$g'_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} - 2\ {}^4\nabla_{(\mu}\xi_{\nu)}\,, \tag{2}$$

with $\xi^\mu = \{\xi,\ \xi^i\}$ $(\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3)$. From (2), preserving $g_{00} = 1$ and $g_{0i} = 0$, it comes out that the following two conditions respectively hold

$$\partial_t\xi = 0 \ \Rightarrow\ t' = t + \xi(x^l) \tag{3}$$

$$h_{ij}\partial_t\xi^J = \partial_i\xi \ \Rightarrow\ x^{i'} = x^i + \partial_j\xi\int h^{ij}dt + \phi^i(x^l)\,, \tag{4}$$

where ϕ^i denote three generic space functions. Finally, for the 3-metric we get the transformation

$$h'_{ij}(t',\ x^{l'}) = h_{ij}(t',\ x^{l'}) - 2\ {}^3\nabla_{(i}\xi_{j)} - \partial_t h_{ij}\xi\,. \tag{5}$$

In a synchronous reference, the Lagrangian of the gravitational field, in presence of a cosmological constant Λ, reads

$$L_{grav} = \int_{\Sigma^3_t} d^3x\mathcal{L}_{grav} = -\frac{1}{2c^2k}\int_{\Sigma^3_t} d^3x\sqrt{h}\left\{K^2 - K_{ij}K^{ij} - {}^3R\right\} - \frac{1}{k}\int_{\Sigma^3_t} d^3x\sqrt{h}\Lambda\,, \tag{6}$$

where k is the Einstein constant ($k = 8\pi G/c^4$), $h \equiv deth_{ij}$ and $K_{ij} \equiv -\frac{1}{2}\partial_t h_{ij}$ refers to the extrinsic curvature, while $K \equiv h^{ij}K_{ij}$. In terms of the Lagrangian density (of weight 1/2) $\mathcal{L}$, the $i-j$ components of the Einstein equations take the Euler-Lagrange form

$$\partial_t\left(\frac{\delta L}{\delta(\partial_t h_{ij})}\right) + \partial_l\left(\frac{\delta L}{\delta(\partial_l h_{ij})}\right) - \frac{\delta L}{\delta h_{ij}} = 0\,. \tag{7}$$

Under an infinitesimal 3-metric displacement $h'_{ij}(t',\ x^{l'}) - h_{ij}(t,\ x^l) = \delta h_{ij} + \partial_t h_{ij}\xi$, the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}$ changes correspondingly as (where, the contribution δh_{ij} is provided by (5) and the 3-metric is transported parallel along the space hypersurfaces)

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\mathcal{L} &= \mathcal{L}_{grav}\left(h'(x'),\ \partial' h'(x')\right) - \mathcal{L}_{grav}\left(h(x),\ \partial h(x)\right) + \delta\mathcal{L}_{mat} = \\ &= \mathcal{L}_{grav}\left(h'(x'),\ \partial' h'(x')\right) - \mathcal{L}_{grav}\left(h(x'),\ \partial' h(x')\right) + \partial_t\mathcal{L}_{grav}\xi + \partial_i\mathcal{L}_{grav}\xi^i + \delta\mathcal{L}_{mat},\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where we adopted a schematic notation for the sake of simplicity.
Since in the following we will see the application to a cosmological setting with a scalar field, we are going to consider the case in which a scalar field ϕ is present.
Hence, let us consider the full Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{grav} + \mathcal{L}_{\Phi}$. The analogous of the expression (5) for the adopted matter field is the following one

$$\varphi'(x^{l'},t') = \varphi(x^{l'},t') - \xi^i\partial_i\varphi - \xi\partial_t\varphi \qquad , \tag{9}$$

while Euler-Lagrange equations are obtained from the ones for the gravitation field, by replacing h_{ij} with φ.
Thus, the invariance request explicitly reads

$$\begin{aligned}\delta L = &\frac{\delta L}{\delta h_{ij}}\delta h_{ij} + \frac{\delta L}{\delta(\partial_l h_{ij})}\delta(\partial_l h_{ij}) + \frac{\delta L}{\delta(\partial_t h_{ij})}\delta(\partial_t h_{ij}) + \\ &+ \frac{\delta L}{\delta\varphi}\delta\varphi + \frac{\delta L}{\delta(\partial_l\varphi)}\delta(\partial_l\varphi) + \frac{\delta L}{\delta(\partial_t\varphi)}\delta(\partial_t\varphi) + \int\partial_t\mathcal{L}\xi d^3x = 0\,,\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where a 3-divergence has been eliminated by suitable conditions at spatial boundary. Making use of equations (7) and avoiding other 3-divergences, we finally arrive to the conservation law

$$\partial_t\left\{\int_{\Sigma^3_t} d^3x\left[\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta(\partial_t h_{ij})}\delta h_{ij} + \frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta(\partial_t\varphi)}\delta\varphi + \mathcal{L}\xi\right]\right\} = 0\,. \tag{11}$$

Substituting (5) and (9) in the above relation, and observing that $\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta(\partial_t h_{ij})}$ and $\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta(\partial_t\varphi)}$ give the conjugate momenta π^{ij} and π to the variables h_{ij} and φ respectively, we rewrite (11) in the form

$$\partial_t\left\{\int_{\Sigma_t^3} d^3x\left[-2\pi^{ij}\ {}^3\nabla_i\xi_j-\xi^i\pi\partial_i\varphi-\left(\pi^{ij}\partial_t h_{ij}+\pi\partial_t\varphi-\mathcal{L}\right)\xi\right]\right\}=0\,. \quad (12)$$

Above, the second term in parentheses coincides with the super-Hamiltonian H, while the first one, by virtue of (3) and (4) and integrating by parts, can be restated as

$$\int_{\Sigma_t^3} d^3x\left[(2\ {}^3\nabla_j\pi_i^j-\pi\partial_i\varphi)\left(\phi^i+\partial_l\xi\int dth^{il}\right)\right]. \quad (13)$$

Recalling that the super-momentum H_i is given by $-2\ {}^3\nabla_j\pi_i^j+\pi\partial_i\varphi$, taking into (12) the time derivative and using the relation $\partial_t\xi^i=\partial_l\xi h^{li}$, we see that the invariance request reads

$$\int_{\Sigma_t^3} d^3x\left\{-\partial_t(H_i)\left(\phi^i+\partial_l\xi\int dth^{il}\right)-\left(\partial_t H-\partial_l H^l\right)\xi\right\}=0\,. \quad (14)$$

Since $\xi^\mu=\{\xi,\ \xi^i\}$ are four generic (independent) displacements, then the solution to the above integral equation is provided by the following constraints

$$\partial_t H_i=0\ ,\ \partial_t H=\partial_l H^l\,. \quad (15)$$

The first three constraints yield $H_i=k_i(x^l)$, reducing the fourth one to $\partial_t H=\partial_l k^l$. We now observe that H does not depend explicitly on time while, on the other hand, the super-momentum constraints have to remain independent by each other because the pure 3-diffeomorphisms are included into the transformations (3) in correspondence to $\xi\equiv 0$ (*i.e.* we must have $\partial_i k^i\neq 0$, if $k_i\neq 0$). Therefore, the only available solution to the system (15) stands as the following constraints

$$H^*\equiv H-\mathcal{E}(x^l)=0\quad H_i=0\,. \quad (16)$$

The obtained result outlines how, preserving in geometrodynamics the synchronous character of the reference, we are lead to a non-vanishing super-Hamiltonian, while the 3-diffeomorphisms invariance still holds due to the constraint $H_i=0$.
Since $\mathcal{E}$ is a scalar density of weight 1/2, then we can take it in the form $\mathcal{E}\equiv -2\sqrt{h}\rho(t,\ x^i)$ (ρ being a scalar space-time function). The action associated to this system of constraints corresponds to the following modification of the Einstein-Hilbert one, in presence of a cosmological constant and of a scalar field,

$$S=-\frac{1}{2c^2k}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}(R-2\rho\frac{(N-1)}{N})-\frac{1}{k}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\Lambda+\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\mathcal{L}_\varphi, \quad (17)$$

ρ being a Lagrangian multipliers, which preserves the co-moving character of the reference. Hence the Hamiltonian is given by

$$\mathcal{H}=\int d^3x(N(H-\mathcal{E})+N^iH_i) \quad (18)$$

and, once a canonical symplectic structure is introduced, the algebra of constraints is as follows

$$\{H_i(x), H_j(y)\} = H_i(x)\delta_{,j}(x-y) - H_j(y)\delta_{,i}(x-y) \tag{19}$$

$$\{H^*(x), H_i(y)\} = -H^*(y)\delta_{,i}(x-y) \tag{20}$$

$$\{H^*(x), H^*(y)\} = H^i(x)\delta_{,i}(x-y) - H^i(y)\delta_{,i}(x-y). \tag{21}$$

We now observe that the constraints $\{H^* = 0,\ H_i = 0\}$ still obey a closed algebra for their Poisson brackets (see [3] and [17]).

By its role in the super-Hamiltonian constraint, the function ρ acquires the physical meaning of energy density associated to a co-moving dust fluid.

In fact, we are describing a scenario in which a source for the Einstein equation is present, which is co-moving with the slicing and provides the modification (16) to the constraints of General Relativity. In presence of a fluid with an equation of state $p = (\Xi - 1)\rho$, the Einstein system in the slicing picture reads

$$\rho = -\frac{H}{2\sqrt{h}}, \qquad H_i = 0, \qquad G_{\mu\nu}\partial_i y^\mu \partial_j y^\nu \equiv G_{ij} = \kappa(\Xi - 1)\rho h_{ij}\,. \tag{22}$$

Hence, the conservation law for the energy-momentum tensor, *i.e.* $T^\nu_{\mu;\nu} = 0$ implies the following two conditions

$$\Xi\,(\rho u^\mu)_{;\mu} = (\Xi - 1)u^\mu \partial_\mu \rho \tag{23}$$

$$u^\nu u_{\mu;\nu} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\Xi}\right)(\partial_\mu \ln\rho - u_\mu u^\nu \partial_\nu \ln\rho)\ . \tag{24}$$

Once the splitting is adapted to the fluid, which means setting the vector normal to the splitting $n^\mu \equiv u^\mu = \delta^\mu_0$, a Gaussian geodesics frame is fixed ($N = 1$ and $N^i = 0$) and the consistency of the equation (24) requires $\Xi = 1$ (dust fluid). In this case, a solution of equation (23) is given by

$$(\rho u^\mu)_{;\mu} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\left(\sqrt{-g}\rho u^\mu\right)_{,\mu} = \sqrt{h}\partial_t\rho = 0 \rightarrow \rho = -\bar{\epsilon}(x^l)/2\sqrt{h}. \tag{25}$$

The most natural way of thinking about the appearance of such a new contribution is that the reference fixing procedure requires a physical realization of the synchronous gauge.

Furthermore, the allowance for such a new source contribution preserves the 4-diffeomorphism invariance, even though fixing a synchronous reference frame leads to modified Hamiltonian constraints.

Here two main points call for attention.

i)—The energy density ρ is not always positive.

ii)—The quantity $\mathcal{E}(x^i)$ is fixed by the initial conditions we assign on a non-singular hypersurface and therefore it can be, in principle, fixed as arbitrarily small.

3. CANONICAL QUANTIZATION OF THE MODEL

By the Lagrangian (6), the Hamiltonian density (*i.e.* the super-Hamiltonian in a synchronous reference frame) takes the explicit form

$$H \equiv 2c^2kG_{ijkl}\pi^{ij}\pi^{kl}-\frac{1}{2k}\sqrt{h}\,{}^3R\,, \quad G_{ijkl} \equiv \frac{1}{2\sqrt{h}}(h_{ik}h_{jl}+h_{il}h_{jk}-h_{ij}h_k)\,, \tag{26}$$

where ${}^3R$ denotes the 3-dimensional Ricci scalar.

The canonical quantization of the synchronous gravitational field is achieved by upgrading the canonical variables h_{ij} and π^{ij} to operators acting on the state function χ, *i.e.*

$$h_{ij} \to \hat{h}_{ij} \qquad \pi^{ij} \to \hat{\pi}^{ij} = -\frac{i\hbar}{(2ck)^{3/2}}\frac{\delta(\quad)}{\delta h_{ij}} \tag{27}$$

and then implementing the synchronous constraints $H^* = 0$ and $H_i = 0$ as follows

$$\hat{H}^*\chi_{\mathcal{E}} = 0 \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \hat{H}\chi_{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E}\chi_{\mathcal{E}} \tag{28}$$

$$\hat{H}_i\chi_{\mathcal{E}} = 0\,. \tag{29}$$

To safe the Hermitianity of the super-Hamiltonian, we are lead to take the operator ordering (see [9])

$$G_{ijkl}\pi^{ij}\pi^{kl} \longrightarrow \hat{\pi}^{ij}G_{ijkl}\hat{\pi}^{kl}\,. \tag{30}$$

Being the super-Hamiltonian non-vanishing, it turns out that the dynamics is fixed by the Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar\partial_t\chi = \int_{\Sigma^3_t}\hat{H}d^3x\chi\,, \tag{31}$$

and the wave-functional evolves with the label time.

The interpretation of the super-Hamiltonian eigenvalue as physical matter, relies on the proof that a region of positive energy density exists.

Having in mind this idea, we adopt more convenient variables to express the 3-metric tensor, *i.e.*

$$h_{ij} \equiv \eta^{4/3}u_{ij}\,, \tag{32}$$

with $\eta \equiv h^{1/4}$ and $det u_{ij} = 1$.
Expressed via these variables, the synchronous action reads

$$S = \int_{\Sigma^3_t}\left\{p_\eta\partial_t\eta + p^{ij}\partial_t u_{ij} - H\right\}d^3x dt\,, \tag{33}$$

where p_η and p^{ij} denote the conjugate momenta to η and u_{ij} respectively, while the Hamiltonian density takes the form

$$H = -\frac{3}{16}c^2kp_\eta^2 + \frac{2c^2k}{\eta^2}u_{ik}u_{jl}p^{ij}p^{kl} - \frac{1}{2k}\eta^{2/3}V(u_{ij},\ \nabla\eta,\ \nabla u_{ij})\,. \tag{34}$$

Here, the potential term V comes from the 3-Ricci scalar and ∇ refers to first and second order spatial gradients.

In this picture, the first of the equations (28) takes the form

$$\hat{H}\chi_{\mathcal{E}} = \left\{\frac{3}{128\hbar ck^2}\frac{\delta^2}{\delta\eta^2} - \frac{1}{4\hbar ck^2\eta^2}\Delta_u - \frac{1}{2k}\eta^{2/3}V(u_{ij},\ \nabla\eta,\ \nabla u_{ij})\right\}\chi_{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E}\chi_{\mathcal{E}} \tag{35}$$

$$\Delta_u \equiv \frac{\delta}{\delta u_{ij}}u_{ik}u_{jl}\frac{\delta}{\delta u_{kl}}\,, \tag{36}$$

From a qualitative point of view, the existence of solutions for the system (35) with negative values of $\mathcal{E}$ can be inferred from its Klein-Gordon-like structure. However, the Landau-Raichoudhuri theorem states that, in a synchronous reference, the metric determinant always vanishes monotonically in correspondence to an instant of time t^* where all the geodesics lines cross each other, i.e $\eta(t^*, x^i) = 0$, with $\partial_{t\rightarrow t^*}\eta > 0$. Such a classical property of the variable η, on one hand supports its meaning of internal time and, on the other one, it allows us to take the limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$, where the system (35) admits an asymptotic solution. In fact, in this limit, the potential term is drastically suppressed with respect to the Δ_u one and the dynamics of different spatial points decouples. Thus, the quantization scheme reduces to a local minisuperspace approach.

It is easy to see that such approximate dynamics admits, point by point in space, the solution

$$\chi_{\mathcal{E}} = \iota_{\mathcal{E}}(\eta, p)G_{p^2}(u_{ij})\,, \tag{37}$$

ι and G_{p^2} satisfying respectively the two equations

$$\left\{\frac{1}{\hbar ck^2}\frac{\delta^2}{\delta\eta^2} + \frac{32p^2}{\hbar ck^2\eta^2}\right\}\iota_{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E}\iota_{\mathcal{E}} \tag{38}$$

$$\Delta_u G_{p^2} = -p^2 G_{p^2}\,. \tag{39}$$

The potential term is negligible, also on a quantum level, as soon as the following condition holds

$$\frac{p^2}{4\hbar ck^2\eta^2} \gg \frac{1}{2k}\eta^{2/3}\frac{1}{\Delta u}\int_{\Delta u} d^5u V. \tag{40}$$

This relation stands for a wide range of p^2 values, approaching $\eta = 0$, and it can be obtained by considering a wave packet laying over a region $\Delta u \sim 1/\Delta p \gg 1$, where Δp is a small uncertainty around the picked value p ($p \gg \Delta p$). Hence the last condition singles out values of p greater than a fiducial one $p_0 \sim \Delta p$, according to the prescription that a quantum-classical correspondence stands only for high quantum numbers.

As far as we take $\iota = \sqrt{\eta}\theta(\eta)$ and we consider the negative part of the spectrum $\mathcal{E} = -\mid \mathcal{E} \mid$, the function θ obeys the equation

$$\frac{\delta^2\theta}{\delta\eta^2} + \frac{1}{\eta}\frac{\delta\theta}{\delta\eta} + \left(\mid \mathcal{E}' \mid - \frac{q^2}{\eta^2}\right)\theta = 0 \tag{41}$$

$$\mathcal{E}' \equiv \hbar ck^2\mathcal{E}, \qquad q^2 \equiv \frac{1}{4}\left(1 - 128p^2\right)\,. \tag{42}$$

Thus we see that a negative part of the spectrum exists in correspondence to the solution

$$\theta(\eta,\ \mathcal{E},\ p) = AJ_q(\sqrt{\mid \mathcal{E}' \mid}\eta) + BJ_{-q}(\sqrt{\mid \mathcal{E}' \mid}\eta)\,, \tag{43}$$

where $J_{\pm q}$ denote the corresponding Bessel functions, while A and B are two integration constants. This solution remains valid only as far as $\mid p \mid< 1/(8\sqrt{2})$.

To give a precise physical meaning to this picture, the following four main points have to be addressed.

i) The existence of a stable ground level of negative energy has to be inferred or provided by additional conditions. ii) The spatial gradients of the dynamical variables and therefore the associated super-momentum constraints, have to be included into the problem and treated in a consistent way. iii) The physical nature of the limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$ has to be clarified by a physical characterization of the dynamics. iv) In order to restore general covariance in the classical limit, $\mathcal{E}$ has to vanish for $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. But, to be retained in the zero-order WKB approximation $\mathcal{E}$ should behave like $\hbar^{1-b}$ $(b > 0)$.

We conclude this section by stressing that, in the quantum regime, the values available for $\mathcal{E}$ are provided by the super-Hamiltonian spectrum. Thus, they depend on the boundary conditions fixed for the system, but not on the initial form of the wavefunctional. As a consequence, the induced (quantum) fluid is determined by the intrinsic properties of the geometrodynamics and the test character of this dust is no longer ensured.

4. EVOLUTIONARY QUANTUM COSMOLOGY

In order to investigate the implications of the synchronous quantum dynamics, we now present results, based on the works [18] and [19], on the behavior of a generic inhomogeneous Universe. In fact, the absence of specific symmetries is required by the impossibility of preserving them in quantum cosmology at super-horizon scales.

The quantum implementation into an evolutionary framework will be presented in the following subsection.

4.1. GENERIC COSMOLOGICAL SOLUTION

As shown in [42], a generic inhomogeneous cosmological model (in terms of Misner variables α and $\beta_\pm$) is described by the action

$$S_{Red} = \int_{\Sigma^3_t \times \mathcal{R}} dtd^3y \left\{p_\alpha \partial_t \alpha + p_+ \partial_t \beta_+ + p_- \partial_t \beta_- + p_\varphi \partial_t \varphi - H\right\} \tag{44}$$

$$H = \frac{c^2 k e^{-3\alpha}}{3}\left[-p_\alpha^2 + p_+^2 + p_-^2\right] + \frac{3}{8\pi} p_\phi^2 - U(\alpha,\ \beta_\pm) + \frac{\Lambda}{k} e^{3\alpha} \tag{45}$$

$$U = \frac{1}{2k \mid J \mid^2} e^\alpha V(\beta_\pm), \quad V(\beta_\pm) = \lambda_1^2 e^{4\beta_+ + 4\sqrt{3}\beta_-} + \lambda_2^2 e^{4\beta_+ - 4\sqrt{3}\beta_-} + \lambda_3^2 e^{-8\beta_+}\,, \tag{46}$$

y^a being a suitable set of spatial coordinates, with J the Jacobian of the transformation $y^a = y^a(x^l)$. Here the functions $\lambda_a(y^b(x^l))$ fix the model inhomogeneity.

Above, to account for the inflationary scenario, we included in the dynamics a massless scalar field φ and a cosmological constant Λ. The presence of these two terms allow us to model the main features of the inflaton field dynamics in the pre-inflation and slow-rolling phases, respectively. However, both φ and Λ have also an important dynamical role. In fact, on one hand, the presence of this scalar field is crucial to neglect the potential term U on a classical [23, 24] and a quantum level [25]. The kinetic term of φ is able to destroy the chaotic behavior induced by the spatial curvature, and therefore here no serious differences are expected in comparison with to the loop quantum gravity approach (in such a formulation, the chaoticity would disappear even without the scalar field [26]). On the other hand, the later de-Sitter dynamics, associated to the slow-rolling regime, provides the isotropization of the causal homogeneous portions of the Universe [27], justifying the estimations (based on the actual Universe parameters) which we will address below for our generic model.

4.2. THE QUANTUM DYNAMICS

Since the total Hamiltonian of the system reduces, near the singularity, to the sum of ∞^3 independent point-like contributions, the Wheeler superspace is decomposed into ∞^3 minisuperspaces and the Schrödinger functional equation splits correspondingly. Fixing the space point x^l (*i.e.* $y^a(x^l)$), the quantum dynamics reads (we denote by the subscript x any minisuperspace quantity)

$$i\hbar\partial_t\psi_x = \hat{H}_x\psi_x = \frac{c^2\hbar^2 k}{3}\left[\partial_\alpha e^{-3\alpha}\partial_\alpha - e^{-3\alpha}\left(\partial_+^2 + \partial_-^2\right)\right]\psi_x - \frac{3\hbar^2}{8\pi}e^{-3\alpha}\partial_\varphi^2\psi_x - \\ - \left(\frac{1}{2k \mid J \mid^2}e^{\alpha}V(\beta_\pm) - \frac{\Lambda}{k}e^{3\alpha}\right)\psi_x \tag{47}$$

$$\psi_x = \psi_x(t,\ \alpha,\ \beta_\pm,\ \varphi)\,. \tag{48}$$

We now take the following integral representation for the wave function ψ_x

$$\psi_x = \int d\mathcal{E}_x \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{E}_x)\sigma_x(\alpha,\ \beta_\pm,\ \varphi,\ \mathcal{E}_x) exp\left\{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_{t_0}^{t} N_x\mathcal{E}_x dt'\right\} \tag{49}$$

$$\sigma_x = \xi_x(\alpha,\ \mathcal{E}_x)\Pi_x(\alpha,\ \beta_\pm,\ \varphi)\,, \tag{50}$$

where $\mathcal{B}$ is fixed by the initial conditions at t_0. Hence, we get the following reduced problems

$$\hat{H}\sigma_x = \mathcal{E}_x\sigma_x \tag{51}$$

$$\left(-\partial_+^2 - \partial_-^2 - \frac{9\hbar^2}{8\pi c^2 k}\partial_\varphi^2\right)\Pi_x - \frac{3}{2c^2\hbar^2k^2 \mid J \mid^2}e^{4\alpha}V(\beta_\pm)\Pi_x = v^2(\alpha)\Pi_x \tag{52}$$

$$\left[\frac{c^2\hbar^2 k}{3}\left(\partial_\alpha e^{-3\alpha}\partial_\alpha\xi_x + e^{-3\alpha}v^2(\alpha)\right) + \frac{\Lambda}{k}e^{3\alpha}\right]\xi_x = \mathcal{E}_x\xi_x\,. \tag{53}$$

Above, in deriving the equation for ξ_x, we neglected the dependence of π_x on α because, asymptotically to the singularity ($\alpha \rightarrow -\infty$), it has to be of higher order (*i.e.* we address an adiabatic approximation). If we take the plane wave solution $\pi_x \propto e^{i(v_+\beta_+ + v_-\beta_- + v_\varphi\varphi)}$, then we get

$$v^2 \equiv v_+^2 + v_-^2 + \frac{9}{8\pi c^2 k} v_\varphi^2 = const. \tag{54}$$

and, in the limit $\alpha \rightarrow -\infty$, this choice is a good approximation as far as the following condition holds

$$v_\beta^2 \equiv v_+^2 + v_-^2 \gg \frac{3e^{4\alpha}}{2c^2\hbar^2 k^2 \mid J \mid^2} \mid \bar{V} \mid, \qquad \bar{V} \equiv \frac{1}{\Delta\beta}\int_{\Delta\beta^2} d^2\beta \left\{V(\beta_\pm)\right\} . \tag{55}$$

Here, instead of ideal monochromatic solutions, we considered wave packets which are flat over the width $\Delta\beta \sim 1/\Delta v_\beta \gg 1$ (Δv_β being the standard deviation in the momenta space).

Once the new variable $\tau = e^{3\alpha}$ is adopted, the above eigenvalues problem for the wavefunction ξ_x reads

$$\frac{c^2\hbar^2 k}{3}\left(9\frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} + \frac{v^2}{\tau^2}\right)\xi_x + \frac{\Lambda}{k}\xi_x = \frac{\mathcal{E}_x}{\tau}\xi_x \, . \tag{56}$$

Here the potential term reads $\mathcal{O}\left(\tau^{-2/3}\right)$ and therefore the cosmological term dominates as far as the following condition holds

$$L_\Lambda \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}} \ll L_{in} \equiv \frac{\tau^{1/3}}{\langle\lambda\rangle} \, , \tag{57}$$

where $\langle\lambda\rangle$ denotes an average value on the functions λ_a. The above relation corresponds to the request that the length scale associated to the "vacuum energy" (L_Λ) is much less then the physical scale of the Universe inhomogeneity (L_{in}), that is just one of the usual constraints for starting the inflation.

Searching for a solution to equation (56) in the form $\xi_x = \tau^\delta f_x(\tau)$, we get

$$\delta = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 \pm \sqrt{1 - \frac{4}{9}v^2}\right) \tag{58}$$

$$\frac{d^2 f_x}{d\tau^2} + \frac{1}{\tau}\left(2\delta\frac{df_x}{d\tau} - \frac{1}{3L_{\mathcal{E}} l_P^2}\right) + \frac{1}{3L_\Lambda^2 l_P^4} f_x = 0 \, , \tag{59}$$

$L_{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{\hbar c}{\mathcal{E}}$ being the characteristic length associated to the Universe "energy", while $l_P \equiv \sqrt{\hbar c k}$ denotes the Planck scale length.

Hence, it is easy to check that, within the precision of our potential-free regime, the solution of the above equation admits an exponential form (as boundary conditions, we require that ξ vanishes in correspondence to the singularity in $\tau = 0$ and decays at large τ, where the potential becomes relevant), *i.e.*

$$f = \mathcal{C} exp\{-\beta^2\tau^2 + \gamma\tau\} \tag{60}$$

$$\gamma = 2 \mid \beta \mid \sqrt{\delta + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{12 L_\Lambda^2 l_P^4 \beta^2}}, \qquad \frac{1}{L_\mathcal{E} l_P^2} = 6\delta\gamma\,. \tag{61}$$

We see that the quantum dynamics in a fixed space point (*i.e.* over a causal portion of the Universe) is described, in the considered approximation ($\tau \ll 1$), by a free wavepacket for the variables $\beta_\pm$ and φ and by a profile in τ which has a maximum in $\tau = (\gamma + \sqrt{\gamma^2 + 8\delta\beta^2})/4\beta^2$.
We stress that above the constant $\mathcal{C}$ has to be regarded in σ_x as a generic function of the quantum numbers $\{k_\pm,\ k_\varphi\}$.

To estimate the range of variation for the eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_x$, *i.e.* the length $L_\mathcal{E}$, we observe that the maximum value admissible for the quantity δ corresponds to $v^2 = 0$, *i.e.* $\delta = 1$. Furthermore, the validity of the solution above requires that the condition $\beta^2\tau \ll \gamma = 2\sqrt{\delta + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{12L_\Lambda^2 l_P^4 \beta^2}} \mid \beta \mid$ (which implies $\mid \beta \mid \tau \ll \sqrt{6}\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{18 L_\Lambda^2 l_P^4 \beta^2}}$) holds.

In agreement with the idea that the gravitational field has a natural lattice structure on the Planckian scale [28], we can take as minimal value for the variable τ, the amount l_{Pl}^3. Putting together these considerations, we arrive to the fundamental inequality

$$\mid \beta \mid \ll \frac{\sqrt{6}}{l_P^3}\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{18 L_\Lambda^2 l_P^4 \beta^2}}\,. \tag{62}$$

The reality of the square root (δ and β have to be real to ensure the reality of $\mathcal{E}$) requires that $\mid \beta \mid \geq \frac{1}{3\sqrt{2} L_\Lambda l_P^2}$. If, as expected, $L_\Lambda \gg l_P$, then the above inequality (62) reads $\mid \beta \mid \ll 1/l_P^3$ (because the neglected term behaves as $\mathcal{O}\,(l_P^2/L_\Lambda^2) \ll 1$), or equivalently

$$\mid \mathcal{E}_x \mid \ll \frac{c^2 k \hbar^2}{l_{Pl}^3} \sim \mathcal{O}(M_{Pl}c^2) \rightarrow L_\mathcal{E} \gg l_P\,, \tag{63}$$

where $M_{Pl} \equiv \hbar/(l_{Pl}c)$ is the Planck mass.
It is worth noting that here the appearance of a stable ground state for the model is a consequence of the cut-off request. According to the standard interpretation of quantum mechanics, we make the assumption that the Universe must necessarily approach this state of minimal "energy" as a result of its spontaneous evolution.

As shown in [29], the above range of variation for the super-Hamiltonian eigenvalue leads, in the isotropic case, to a negligible contribution of this term toward the actual Universe critical parameter, when an inflationary stage is (like here) addressed. In fact, to estimate the critical parameter associated to the new contribution, say $\Omega_\mathcal{E}$, we observe that the super-Hamiltonian eigenvalue, in the classical limit, behaves as a constant of motion and therefore it provides today the energy density $\rho_\mathcal{E} \ll \mathcal{O}((M_{Pl}c^2)/R_0^3)$ ($R_0 \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{28}cm)$ denoting the present Universe radius of curvature). Since the actual critical density can be expressed as $\rho_c \sim \mathcal{O}(c^4/[GR_0^2(\Omega-1)])$ (being $\Omega = 1 \pm \mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$ the total Universe critical parameter), then we have

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{E}} \equiv \frac{\rho_{\mathcal{E}}}{\rho_c} \ll \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{10^{-2}GM_{Pl}}{c^2R_0}\right) \sim \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{10^{-2}l_{Pl}}{R_0}\right) \sim \mathcal{O}\left(10^{-60}\right). \tag{64}$$

Thus, to regard the dust fluid as a *dark matter candidate*, "matter" (from the thermal bath) must play a relevant role in the Planckian Universe evolution (see the model addressed in [30, 31], where ultrarelativistic matter and a perfect gas were included). The correspondence between the isotropic case and the generic dynamics is possible because the last is homogeneous at the horizon scale, and the anisotropies contribution is isomorphic to the scalar field one (both providing a free energy density $\propto e^{-6\alpha}$).

5. THE QUASI-CLASSICAL LIMIT

Though we solved equation (56) only in the limit of small values of τ, where the spatial curvature is negligible, nevertheless we now show that conditions for the classical limit of the τ-dynamics exist within such approximation. For a discussion on the decoherence of the scale factor in a Freedam-Robertson-Walker space-time see [32] (for the semi-classical limit of the Wheeler-DeWitt dynamics in a more general case see [33]).

In the variables $\{\tau,\ \beta_\pm,\ \varphi\}$, the local minisuperspace line element reads

$$d\Gamma^2 = -\frac{1}{3c^2k\tau}d\tau^2 + \frac{3\tau}{c^2k}\left(d\beta_+^2 + d\beta_-^2\right) + \frac{8\pi\tau}{3}d\varphi^2\,. \tag{65}$$

Thus, for small Universe volumes, we construct the semiclassical limit of the considered model, applying a procedure in the spirit fixed in [35] and allowed by the decoupling of the asymptotic classical τ-dynamics from all other variables.

Aim of the analysis here faced is to separate the evolution of the quasi-classical variable τ, from the quantum anisotropies $\beta_\pm$ and the scalar field φ, for which an Hilbert space can then be defined.

Having in mind this picture and fixing, by the line element above, the timelike variable τ as the quasi-classical component of the Universe, we can take the (point-like) wave function σ in the form

$$\sigma = \mu(\tau) exp\left\{i\frac{\Phi(\tau)}{\hbar}\right\}\mathcal{P}(\tau,\ \beta_\pm,\ \varphi)\,. \tag{66}$$

Substituting this expression into the eigenvalue problem (51), taking the limit $\hbar \to 0$ ($i.e.\ \tau \gg l_P^3$) and addressing the approximations fixed in [35], then we get the following system of three coupled equations

$$-3c^2k\left(\frac{d\Phi}{d\tau}\right)^2 + \frac{\Lambda}{k} - \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\tau} = 0 \tag{67}$$

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}\left(\mu^2\frac{d\Phi}{d\tau}\right)=0 \tag{68}$$

$$6i\hbar c^2k\frac{d\Phi}{d\tau}\frac{\partial\mathcal{P}}{\partial\tau}=\frac{1}{\tau^2}\left[\frac{\hbar^2c^2k}{3}\left(\partial_+^2+\partial_-^2\right)+\frac{3}{8\pi}\partial_\varphi^2\right]\mathcal{P}\,. \tag{69}$$

The first equation gives the Hamilton-Jacobi dynamics and therefore the identification $p_\tau = d\Phi/d\tau$ naturally arises (p_τ being the conjugate momentum to the variable τ). Starting from the action (44), it is easy to check the relation $-6c^2kp_\tau = \partial_t\tau/\tau$. Hence the equation for the wave function $\mathcal{P}$ takes the meaningful Schrödinger form

$$i\hbar\partial_t\mathcal{P}=-\frac{1}{\tau(t)}\left[\frac{\hbar^2c^2k}{3}\left(\partial_+^2+\partial_-^2\right)+\frac{3}{8\pi}\partial_\varphi^2\right]\mathcal{P}\,, \tag{70}$$

where the function $\tau(t)$ is assigned by the classical dynamics (containing the dust term too). In the present evolutionary scheme it comes out from the equation

$$t=\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial\mathcal{E}}+t^*,\ t^*=const.. \tag{71}$$

Since the Universe lies expectantly in the ground state of negative energy (*i.e.* we take $\mathcal{E}=-\mid\mathcal{E}\mid$), then, in the region $\tau \ll L_{\mathcal{E}}L_\Lambda^2$, the Hamilton-Jacobi equation and the coupled one for the amplitude μ, admit the solutions

$$\Phi=2\sqrt{\frac{\mid\mathcal{E}\mid}{3c^2k}\tau}\qquad \mu=\mathcal{D}\sqrt[4]{\tau}\qquad \mathcal{D}=\mathcal{D}(x^i)\,; \tag{72}$$

above, we set to zero the integration constant for Φ, because it provides only a phase factor.
It can be verified that such behaviors of Φ and μ are in agreement with the approximations at the ground of the system (67).
The solution of the Schrödinger equation (70) has exactly the same form of a 3-dimensional non-relativistic free particle, as soon as the time variable $\mathcal{T}=\int(dt/\tau(t))$ is adopted.

Thus we show how the energy spectrum arises near the cosmological singularity. Indeed, the question concerning the classical limit of such degrees of freedom remains open. The description of a transition, from the quantum mixmaster to a classical isotropic Universe, remains an open topic in theoretical cosmology and the different proposals for its solution strictly depend on the initial condition on the system (for a discussion in the Wheeler-DeWitt approach see [36, 37]). In the present context, we stress that, sooner or later (out of our approximation scheme), the potential terms, both for the anisotropic variable and the scalar field, would become important in the evolution. It is just in this phase that we expect the appearance of a classical behavior. This point of view is supported by the quadratic feature that such potential terms must approach. The potential of the mixmaster becomes quadratic in $\beta_\pm$ as far as the Universe expansion (*i.e.* increasing values of τ) frozes out the corresponding anisotropy (*i.e.* small values of $\beta_\pm$ are approached). The potential term associated to the scalar field is quadratic near its stable minimum, which must exist before the spontaneous symmetry breaking of the inflationary scenario. Therefore, wave-packets peaked around small values of $\beta_\pm$ and φ seem favorable in reaching the classical limit.

When the system falls into this quadratic approximation, stable coherent states can be constructed with classical properties.

6. FROM THE SYNCHRONOUS REFERENCE TO A GENERAL POINT OF VIEW

The results of the above discussion outline that synchronous quantum gravity is an evolutionary theory of the space-time, but the associated phenomenology seems to be compatible, on a cosmological level, with the Wheeler-DeWitt paradigm: both the approaches provide General Relativity in the classical limit for $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. The key feature here is the dependence on $\hbar$ acquired by the super-Hamiltonian eigenvalue. This picture suggests us to investigate for more general contexts which would predict evolving wave-functionals only up to some order in $\hbar$. In this respect, we fix our attention on the relations existing between a statistical representation of a stochastic system and its semi-classical features as coming out of the WKB limit.

The physical reason leading us to compare the semi-classical limit of the quantum mechanics to an ensamble picture is that, for a stochastic system, two independent (one classical and another semi-classical) probability distributions make sense. Indeed, for any classical dynamics we could define a probability distribution as a delta functional over the deterministic trajectory. Despite this choice would naturally imply the necessity of an evolutionary approach, nevertheless it appears rather ill-defined to be properly addressed (for a discussion of this point of view, as well as of a Bohmian approach to the same question see [39, 40]).

This parallelism fixes, for stochastic gravitational systems, a correspondence between the time evolution of the ensemble distribution and that of the first correction in $\hbar$ to the wave-functional.

6.1. THE GRAVITATIONAL FIELD

Let us now analyze the case of the gravitational field, with the aim of inferring an appropriate equation for its quantum dynamics.

In a generic reference frame, the action describing the gravitational field reads as follows [2]

$$S = \int_{\mathcal{V}4} \left\{ \pi^{ij} \partial_t h_{ij} - NH - N^i H_i \right\} d^3x dt \tag{73}$$

where (here we restate in detail the notation) $\mathcal{V}^4 = \Sigma^3_t \times \mathcal{R}$ denotes the whole 4-manifold (sliced into the 1-parameter family of compact boundaryless 3-hypersurfaces

Σ^3_t), π^{ij} are the conjugate momenta to the 3-dimensional metric tensor h_{ij}, while the gravitational super-Hamiltonian H and the supermomentum H_i take the form

$$H \equiv \frac{16\pi G}{c^2} G_{ijkl}\pi^{ij}\pi^{kl} - \frac{c^4}{16\pi G}\sqrt{h}^3 R, \quad G_{ijkl} \equiv \frac{1}{2\sqrt{h}}(h_{ik}h_{jl}+h_{il}h_{jk}-h_{ij}h_k) \tag{74}$$

$$H_i \equiv -2\ {}^3\nabla_j \pi^j_i\,. \tag{75}$$

In the above expressions, ${}^3R$ and ${}^3\nabla_i(\ )$ denote the Ricci scalar and the covariant derivative constructed by the 3-metric h_{ij} respectively, while $h \equiv deth_{ij}$.

The dynamics of the system is summarized by the following field equations (obtained variating the action with respect to N, N^i, π^{ij} and h_{ij})

$$H = 0\ ,\ H_i = 0 \tag{76}$$

$$\partial_t h_{ij} = \frac{\delta\mathcal{H}}{\delta\pi^{ij}}\ ,\ \partial_t\pi^{ij} = -\frac{\delta\mathcal{H}}{\delta h_{ij}} \tag{77}$$

$$\mathcal{H} \equiv \int_{\Sigma^3_t} d^3x\, \Big\{NH + N^i H_i\Big\}\,. \tag{78}$$

The four constraints $H = H_i = 0$ reflect the 4-diffeomorphism invariance of General Relativity and they are characterized by the following two properties:

i) These constraints are non-evolutionary, *i.e.* if they are satisfied by the Cauchy data on the initial hypersurface (say at $t = t_0$), then they remain valid for all the evolution, in view of the Hamilton equations.

ii) The four constraints lead, under the replacement $\pi^{ij} = \delta S/\delta h_{ij}$, to the Hamilton-Jacobi equations

$$\widehat{HJ}S \equiv \frac{16\pi G}{c^2} G_{ijkl}\frac{\delta S}{\delta h_{ij}}\frac{\delta S}{\delta h_{kl}} - \frac{c^4}{16\pi G}\sqrt{h}^3 R = 0 \tag{79}$$

$$\widehat{HJ}_i S \equiv -2h_{il}\ {}^3\nabla_j \frac{\delta S}{\delta h_{jl}} = 0\,. \tag{80}$$

This set of equations provides alone the whole gravitational field dynamics.

Thus, if we restrict the phase space of a stochastic gravitational system to ensembles which satisfy the constraints above (*i.e.* to the Wheeler phase superspace), then the Hamilton equations fix the dynamics of the system, for which the lapse function N and the shift vector N^i play the role of parametric functions. In analogy to the non-relativistic particle, the continuity equation for the ensemble density (functional) $\varepsilon(t,\ N(t,\ x^l),\ N^i(t,\ x^l),\ h_{ij}(x^l), \pi^{ij})(x^l))$ reads as

$$\partial_t\varepsilon + \int_{\Sigma^3_t} d^3x \frac{\delta}{\delta h_{ij}}\left\{\frac{\delta\mathcal{H}}{\delta\pi^{ij}}\varepsilon\right\} - \int_{\Sigma^3_t} d^3x \frac{\delta}{\delta\pi^{ij}}\left\{\frac{\delta\mathcal{H}}{\delta h_{ij}}\varepsilon\right\} = 0\,. \tag{81}$$

Making use of the following relation

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{H}}{\delta\pi^{ij}}=\frac{32\pi G}{c^2}G_{ijkl}\pi^{kl}+\ {}^3\nabla_iN_j+\ {}^3\nabla_jN_i \qquad , \tag{82}$$

restricting the phase space distribution to the form $\varepsilon=\varrho(t,\ h_{ij})\delta\left(\pi^{ij}-\delta S/\delta h_{ij}\right)$, and evaluating the integral over the momentum space, we arrive to the reduced continuity equation

$$\partial_t\varrho+\frac{32\pi G}{c^2}\int_{\Sigma^3_t}d^3x\frac{\delta}{\delta h_{ij}}\left\{G_{ijkl}\frac{\delta S}{\delta h_{kl}}\varrho\right\}+2\int_{\Sigma^3_t}d^3x\frac{\delta}{\delta h_{ij}}\left\{\ {}^3\nabla_iN_j\varrho\right\}=0\,, \tag{83}$$

$\varrho\equiv\int\varepsilon D\pi$ being the distribution reduced to the configuration space (here $D\pi$ denotes the Lebesgue measure defined for the conjugate momentum).

Observing that (with obvious notation)

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta h_{ij}}\left(\ {}^3\nabla_iN_j\right)=-\frac{1}{2}\ {}^3\nabla_iN^i \tag{84}$$

and since the hypersurfaces Σ^3_t are taken to be compact ones without boundary (which allows us to eliminate total divergences) ‡, then the above equation (83) rewrites

$$\partial_t\varrho+\frac{32\pi G}{c^2}\int_{\Sigma^3_t}d^3x\frac{\delta}{\delta h_{ij}}\left\{G_{ijkl}\frac{\delta S}{\delta h_{kl}}\varrho\right\}-2\int_{\Sigma^3_t}d^3x\left\{N_j\ {}^3\nabla_i\frac{\delta\varrho}{\delta h_{ij}}\right\}=0\,. \tag{85}$$

The dynamics of the system has to be invariant under the infinitesimal 3-diffeomorphism $x^{l'}=x^l+\xi^l(x^j)$ (ξ^l being generic displacements), which induces 3-metric transformations $h'_{ij}=h_{ij}-2\ {}^3\nabla_{(i}\xi_{j)}$.
Requiring that ϱ is invariant under such 3-metric changes, yields $\varrho(h_{ij}-2\ {}^3\nabla_{(i}\xi_{j)})-\varrho(h_{ij})=\delta\varrho=0$, *i.e.*

$$\delta\varrho=-2\int_{\Sigma^3_t}d^3x\left\{\frac{\delta\varrho}{\delta h_{ij}}\ {}^3\nabla_i\xi_j\right\}=2\int_{\Sigma^3_t}d^3x\left\{\ {}^3\nabla_i\left(\frac{\delta\varrho}{\delta h_{ij}}\right)\xi_j\right\}=0\,. \tag{86}$$

Since ξ^i are generic space displacements, we get $2\ {}^3\nabla_j\left(\frac{\delta\varrho}{\delta h_{ij}}\right)=0$.
In view of this result, the ensemble density loses its parametric dependence on the shift vector and it takes values on the 3-geometries $\{h_{ij}\}$. As far as we average the constraint $H=0$ over the momentum space, we recover the Hamilton-Jacobi equation and then the statistical properties of the gravitational system (as viewed in the Wheeler superspace) are summarized by the following functional equations

$$\frac{16\pi G}{c^2}G_{ijkl}\frac{\delta S}{\delta h_{ij}}\frac{\delta S}{\delta h_{kl}}-\frac{c^4}{16\pi G}\sqrt{h}\,{}^3R=0 \tag{87}$$

$$\partial_t\varrho+\frac{32\pi G}{c^2}\int_{\Sigma^3_t}d^3x\frac{\delta}{\delta h_{ij}}\left\{G_{ijkl}\frac{\delta S}{\delta h_{kl}}\varrho\right\}=0 \tag{88}$$

$$\widehat{HJ}_iS=\widehat{HJ}_i\varrho=0\,. \tag{89}$$

---

‡ We stress that the momentum π^{ij}, as well as $\delta\varrho/\delta h_{ij}$ are 3-tensor densities of weight 1/2.

If we develop the time dependence of ϱ in Fourier series, *i.e.*

$$\varrho(t,\ \{h_{ij}\}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \bar{\varrho}(\omega,\ \{h_{ij}\}) e^{i\omega t}\,, \tag{90}$$

then the second of the above equation rewrites as

$$\frac{32\pi G}{c^2}\int_{\Sigma_t^3} d^3x \frac{\delta}{\delta h_{ij}}\left\{G_{ijkl}\frac{\delta S}{\delta h_{kl}}\bar{\varrho}\right\} = -i\hbar\omega\bar{\varrho}\,. \tag{91}$$

This equation, together with the Hamilton-Jacobi system and the condition for 3-diffeomorphisms invariance, provides the statistical framework to be used when fixing the WKB limit of the quantum dynamics.

In analogy to what done for the non-relativistic particle, let us consider the following smeared eigenvalue problem

$$\left\{\int_{\Sigma_t^3} d^3x N\hat{H}\right\}\Psi = E^Q\Psi \tag{92}$$

$$\hat{H}_i\Psi = 0 \tag{93}$$

$$\Psi = \Psi(t,\ N,\ \{h_{ij}\})\,, \tag{94}$$

where the operators $\hat{H}$ and $\hat{H}_i$ are casted via the conjugate ones $\hat{h}_{ij}$ and $\hat{\pi}^{ij} = -i\hbar\delta(\quad)/\delta h_{ij}$ (for the sake of simplicity, here we take $l_P = 1$). To safe the Hermitianity of the super-Hamiltonian, we are lead to take the normal ordering (see [9])

$$G_{ijkl}\pi^{ij}\pi^{kl} \rightarrow -\hbar^2\frac{\delta}{\delta h_{ij}}G_{ijkl}\frac{\delta}{\delta h_{kl}} \tag{95}$$

Taking the expansion

$$\Psi = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\Sigma}\,, \quad \Sigma = \Sigma_0 + \frac{\hbar}{i}\Sigma_1 + \left(\frac{\hbar}{i}\right)^2\Sigma_2 + \ldots\,, \tag{96}$$

then, in the considered WKB limit and up to first order in $\hbar$, from (92) we get the key relation

$$\int_{\Sigma_t^3} d^3x\left\{N\widehat{HJ}\Sigma_0 - i\hbar\frac{\delta}{\delta h_{ij}}\left(G_{ijkl}\frac{\delta\Sigma_0}{\delta h_{kl}}e^{2\Sigma_1}\right)e^{-2\Sigma_1} + \mathcal{O}\left(\hbar^2\right)\right\}\Psi =$$
$$= \left(E_0^Q - E_1^Q + \mathcal{O}\left(\hbar^2\right)\right)\Psi \tag{97}$$

$$\int_{\Sigma_t^3} d^3x\left\{\widehat{HJ}_i\Sigma_0 - i\hbar\widehat{HJ}_i\Sigma_1\right\} = 0\,, \tag{98}$$

The correspondence between this scheme and the ensemble picture leads to the identifications $S \equiv \Sigma_0$, $\varrho \equiv e^{2\Sigma_1}$ and $E_0^Q = 0$, $E_1^Q = \hbar\omega$. Thus, we see that for a stochastic gravitational field, the non-stationary character of the ensemble distribution reflects the existence of a non-zero super-Hamiltonian eigenvalue of order $\hbar$. This result is equivalent to dealing with a Schrödinger equation (like in Section 3), whose associated time evolution entirely lives in the quantum sector, so ensuring the right classical limit of General Relativity.

6.2. THE EXAMPLE OF THE INHOMOGENEOUS MIXMASTER MODEL

As an implementation of the above scheme, we now discuss the asymptotic dynamics of the inhomogeneous mixmaster model which is a widely-known example of a stochastic gravitational system [41]. Here we do not address real new results, but we implement the well-established mixmaster picture to the present analogy between quantum and statistical geometrodynamics.

To get stochasticity we have to remove the presence of a massless scalar field from the evolution of a generic Universe toward the singularity (the cosmological term plays no role asymptotically). Replacing the Misner variables $\{\alpha\ ,\beta_+\ ,\beta_-\}$ with the Misner-Chitrè-like ones $\{\rho\ ,u\ ,v\}$, where u and v define the Poincarè half-plane representation of the two-dimensional Lobachevsky space (for details of the coordinates transformation see [19]), the action (44) rewrites as

$$S_{Red} = \int_{\Gamma_Q} d^3y d\eta \left[p_u \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} + p_v \frac{\partial v}{\partial \eta} + p_\rho \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \eta} - \frac{N e^{-2\rho}}{24 D \mid J \mid} H \right] \tag{99}$$

with

$$H = -p_\rho^2 + v^2 \left(p_u^2 + p_v^2 + U(\rho\ ,u\ .u) \right) \tag{100}$$

and

$$D = \exp[-\sqrt{3} \frac{1 + u + u^2 + v^2}{v} e^\rho]. \tag{101}$$

The potential term $U(\rho\ ,u\ ,v)$ can be easily calculated (see [19, 41]).

According to the analysis developed in the previous subsection, the ensemble representation of this stochastic system takes the following form in the configuration space associated to a space point (in what follows we will omit the subscript y concerning the the point-like distribution $w(\rho\ ,u\ ,v)$)

$$-\left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial \rho}\right)^2 + v^2 \left[\left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial u}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial v}\right)^2 \right] + U(\rho\ ,u\ .u) = 0 \tag{102}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial w}{\partial t} - \frac{N}{12 \mid J \mid} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \left(e^{-2\rho} \frac{\partial S}{\partial \rho} \frac{w}{D} \right) + \\ &+ \frac{N}{12 \mid J \mid} e^{-2\rho} \left[v^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial u} \frac{w}{D} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial v} v^2 \frac{w}{D} \right) \right] = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

S being the Hamilton-Jacobi function.

From the equation above, it can be easily inferred that the limit toward the cosmological singularity $\rho \to \infty$ (where D and all its derivatives vanish) corresponds to asymptotically increasingly smaller values of the time derivative $\frac{\partial w}{\partial t}$. This consideration holds only for a regular enough behavior of the lapse function and it qualitatively confirms that the ensemble distribution has to retain a time dependence which, despite its low-order character, accounts for the relic of an evolutionary quantum gravity.

However, the correct characterization of the obtained ensemble dynamics passes trough a careful discussion of the allowance in fixing the lapse function. In fact, due to the long-wavelength approximation, the spatial gradients of the variable ρ are asymptotically negligible, so that it de-parametrizes (in the line of [12]) and the request

$$\partial_t \rho = -\frac{N e^{-2\tau}}{12 D \mid J \mid} \frac{\partial S}{\partial \tau} = 1 \tag{104}$$

can be imposed to deal with a real time coordinate. When τ plays this role, the corresponding ensemble picture is summarized by the following system

$$- \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial \rho}\right)^2 + v^2 \left[\left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial u}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial v}\right)^2 \right] + U(\rho\ , u\ .u) \equiv$$

$$\equiv - \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial \rho}\right)^2 + (\nabla S)^2 + U(\rho\ , u\ .u) = 0 \tag{105}$$

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial \rho} + v^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial S}{\partial u}}{\sqrt{(\nabla S)^2 + U}} w \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \left(\frac{v^2 \frac{\partial S}{\partial v}}{\sqrt{(\nabla S)^2 + U}} w \right) = 0. \tag{106}$$

When the asymptotic limit $\{\rho \to \infty,\ U \to 0,\ \frac{\partial S}{\partial \rho} = const.\}$ is taken, these equations overlap the stationary picture described in some detail in [42] (see also references therein). However, as shown in [43] (by using at all equivalent variables), the stationary microcanonical distribution is approached by an exponential decay in the ρ-dependence. Such a feature quantitatively defines the time behavior of the ensemble as a lower order effect for a point-like mixmaster Universe.

But, the de-parametrization of the variable ρ and its time role in the dynamics are consistent with a decoherence behavior as discussed in the semiclassical limit above (the main point here is that the asymptotic classical evolution of ρ is independent of the other variables). Therefore, the correspondence between the evolution of the microcanonical ensemble of the mixmaster and a Schrödinger quantum gravity is valid in the limit when only some variables (u and v here) follow a full quantum behavior, while another one (ρ here) is mainly a classical degree of freedom (like in Section 5). Of course, the possibility to deal with a component of a gravitational system as a good time variable, is not a general feature and the full correspondence we established in this section would hold just for those ensembles which make no allowance for any decoherence scenario.

Finally, it is worth noting that the outlined picture of the mixmaster chaoticity qualitatively coincides with the one proposed in [20], with respect to the definition of an ensemble. In fact, the conclusion of our analysis indicates that, in this model, the chaoticity can be properly addressed by means of a relational point of view.

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We proposed an evolutionary paradigm for the reformulation of the quantum gravity problem, based both on the restriction of the covariance principle within a synchronous reference frame, and on the more general correspondence between the ensemble dynamics of stochastic gravitational systems and the semiclassical WKB limit of their quantum dynamics. The common issue of these two different approaches concerned the appearance of a non-zero eigenvalue of the super-Hamiltonian, which turned out to vanish as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. Such contribution accounts for a time evolution of the quantum gravitational field, but it does not affect the right classical limit of General Relativity.

Dealing with the synchronous gauge, we get a non-zero super-Hamiltonian eigenvalue following the scheme of the Noether theorem as applied to the corresponding gravitational Lagrangian. The crucial point here is that this additional term can be re-casted as a dust contribution, which behaves as a source of the gravitational field. Thus, we saw that the gauge fixing induces the appearance of a real matter, playing the role of a reference. The quantum analysis clarifies that such additional contribution has a non-classical origin and, therefore, the limit of General Relativity is always preserved as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$, even if we restricted the dynamics to a synchronous reference (this point was discussed in detail for the quantum cosmology model addressed above).

The merit of the discussion concerning the stochastic gravitational system, consists in the demonstration that the ensemble time evolution would be associated with the first order in $\hbar$ in the expansion of the super-Hamiltonian eigenvalue.

It is worth stressing that the example of the chaotic inhomogeneous mixmaster has outlined the necessity to deal with a Schrödinger equation only in the decoherent picture, when a portion of the system de-parametrizes from the whole and it plays the role of a good time variable.

Acknowledgments

We thank Alessandra Corsi for her help in upgrading the English of the manuscript.

References

[1] B. S. DeWitt, *Phys. Rev.* , (1967), **160**, 1113.
[2] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C.W. Misner, n Gravitation: *An Introduction to Current Research*, edited by L.Witten, Wiley, New York, (1962) ,P.227.
[3] K. V. Kuchar, in *Quantum Gravity II, a second Oxford symposium*, (1981), eds C. J. Isham et al., Clarendom Press., Oxford,
[4] C. J. Isham, *Canonical Quantum Gravity and the Problem of Time*, (1992), available /arxiv:/gr-qc/9201011.
[5] T. P. Shestakova and C. Simeone, *Grav. Cosmol.*, (2004), **10**, 161.
[6] T. Banks, *Nucl. Phys. B*, (1985), **249**, 332.
[7] C. Rovelli, *Class. and Quantum. Grav.* , (1991), **8**, 297 and 317.
[8] C. Rovelli, *Phys. Rev. D*, (1991), **43**, 442.
[9] G. Montani, *Nucl. Phys. B*, (2002), **634**, 370.
[10] S. Mercuri and G. Montani, *Int. Journ. Mod. Phys. D*, (2004) **13**, 165.
[11] K. V. Kuchar and C. Torre, *Phys. Rev. D*, (1991), **43**, 419.
[12] J. D. Brown and K. V. Kuchar, *Phys. Rev. D*, (1995), **51**, 5600.
[13] J. J. Halliwell and J. B. Hartle, *Phys.Rev. D*, (1991), **43**, 1170.

[14] J. B. Hartle, in *Conceptual Problems of Quantum Gravity*, (1991), edited by A. Ashtekar and J. Stachel (Birkhauser, Boston).

[15] J. J. Halliwell, *Phys. Rev. D*, (1991), **43**, 2590.

[16] S.Tomonaga, *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, (1946), **1**, 27; reprinted in "Selected Papers on Quantum Electrodynamics", edited by J. Schwinger (Dover, 1958).

[17] S. Mercuri and G. Montani, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A*, (2004), **19**, n. 20, 1519.

[18] I M Khalatnikov and E M Lifshitz, *Adv. Phys.*, (1963), **12**, 185.

[19] R. Benini and G. Montani, *Phys. Rev. D*, (2004), **70**, 103527.

[20] D. N. Page, W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. D*, (1983), **27**, 2885.

[21] G. Imponente and G. Montani, *Phys. Rev. D*, (2001), **63**, 103501.

[22] C. W. Misner, (1969), **186**, n. 5, 1319.

[23] B. Berger, *Phys. Rev. D*, (2000), **61**, 023508.

[24] G. Montani, *Class. and Quantum Grav.*, (2000), **17**, 2205.

[25] A. A. Kirillov, *JETP Lett.*, (1992), **55** 561.

[26] M. Bojowald and G.Date, *Phys. Rev. Lett*, (2004), **92**, 071302.

[27] A. A. Kirillov and G. Montani, *Phys. Rev. D*, (2002), **66**, 064010.

[28] C. Rovelli and S. Speziale, *Phys. Rev. D*, (2003), **67**, 064019.

[29] G. Montani, *Int. Journ. Mod. Phys. D*, (2003), **12**, n. 8, 1445.

[30] G. Corvino and G. Montani, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A*, (2004), **19**, n. 37, 2777.

[31] M. V. Battisti and G. Montani, *Phys. Lett. B*, (2006), **637**, 203.

[32] C. Kiefer, *Class. Quantum Grav.*, (1987), **4**, 1369.

[33] C. Kiefer, T. P. Singh, *Phys. Rev. D*, (1991), **44**, 1067.

[34] G. Montani, *Int. Journ. Mod. Phys. D*, (2004), **13**, n.8, 1703.

[35] A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D, (1989), **39**, n. 4, 1116.

[36] A.A. Kirillov, G. Montani, *JETP Lett.*, **66**, (1997), 475-479.

[37] B. Bolen, L. Bombelli, A. Corichi, *Class. Quantum Grav.*, **21**, (2004), 4087–4105.

[38] C. Kittel, *Elementary Statistical Physics*, (1958), edited by John Wiley et Sons, Inc..

[39] H. Nikolic, arXiv:gr-qc/0312063.

[40] S. P. Kim, *Phys. Rev. D*, (1995), **52**, 3382.
C. Bertoni, F. Finelli, and G. Venturi, *Class. Quantum Grav.*, (1996), **13**, 2375.
S. P. Kim, *Phys. Rev. D*, (1997), **55**, 7511.

[41] C. W. Misner, K. Thorn, J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, edited by W. H. Freeman et Company, New York, (1973), Chapter 21.

[42] R. Benini and G. Montani, *Class. Quantum Grav.*, **24**, (2007), 387.

[43] G. Montani, *Nuovo Cimento*, **116 B**, (2001), 1375.